

Channels should be made available a la carte to consumers. However, there needs to be provision in the ruling that comprehends that the provider can't (and shouldn't be required to) provide channels a la carte at an operating loss. Consumers always expect something for nothing. They shouldn't expect to receive equipment and installation provided for free when they only subscribe to a single channel for \$2.99/mo. The provider should be allowed to establish a minimum per month subscription rate, for example \$15 or \$25, and the consumer can then select, a la carte, a sufficient number of channels to meet or exceed the minimum subscription requirement. If they choose only two channels, they still pay the \$15 or \$25, even if they could add a dozen more channels and still pay only \$15 or \$25 per month.

Granted, there is the issue of whether going a la carte causes (community service oriented) channels with low viewership off the air, but that can easily be handled by embeddding the cost to provide those channels in the price structure of those channels that consumers would typically order a la carte. Then, the person who orders just two channels for \$15 or \$25 will get the community service oriented channels also, for "free".